



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/506,285 | 08/31/2004 | Rogier Johannes Braak | NL 020191 | 6783 |

24737 7590 09/28/2007
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

ROY, SIKHA

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2879

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

09/28/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/506,285

Applicant(s)

BRAAK ET AL.

Examiner

Sikha Roy

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The Amendment, filed on July 19, 2007 has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Cancellation of claims 14,15 has been entered.

Claims 1-13 and 16-20 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,053,795 to Whitney et al., and further in view of USPN 6,538,374 to Hosokawa.

Regarding claim 1 Whitney discloses (Fig. 10 column 8 lines 23-67) an electronic display device (toy stove or burner) comprising a light source 82C, a light-absorbing filter 126 covering the source, a semitransparent reflective layer (polarizer 38C) covering the filter. The recitation of 'for transmitting light emanating from the polymer LED display and for reflecting ambient light' has not been given patentable weight because is considered an intended used recitation. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus

Art Unit: 2879

satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987). Whitney teaches (column 6 lines 1-20, 47-52) the source can be an electroluminescent sheet with organic light emitter including polymer LEDs which are known in the art and electrical connection for exciting the polymer LEDs.

Whitney is silent about the geometrical arrangement of individually excitable polymer LEDs .

Hosokawa in pertinent art discloses (Figs. 7,8,10) a polymer LED display comprising geometrical arrangement of individually excitable polymer LEDs for forming image and comprising electrical connections for exciting the polymer LEDs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use geometrically arrangement of individually excitable polymer LEDs as disclosed by Hosokawa for the light source of Whitney for providing suitable image since suitable substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results is within the skill of the art.

Regarding claims 2 and 4 Whitney discloses(column 9 lines 30-46) the semitransparent reflective layer is a reflective polarizer which includes a dual brightness enhancement film.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,538,374 to Hosokawa, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,007,396 to Wisbey et al.

Regarding claim 1 Hosokawa discloses (Figs 5,7,10) a display device comprising a polymer LED display comprising a geometrical arrangement of individually excitable

Art Unit: 2879

polymer LEDs for forming image and comprising electrical connections (TFT active matrix layer), a light absorbing filter layer 60 covering the display.

Hosokawa is silent about a semitransparent reflective layer covering the filter layer.

Wisbey in pertinent field of light emitting displays discloses (Fig. 6 column 2 lines 43-61) plurality of LED devices 10 mounted on a substrate 11 and a semitransparent reflective layer (aluminum film 12 evaporated under onto a glass cover 13) provided on the LED devices on the substrate. Wisbey teaches this configuration allows most of the substrate to be obscured by the reflecting film and can be used to hide the bonding wires for driving LED devices.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the semi-transparent reflecting film on the cover the of the display device of Cok as disclosed by Wiseby for obscuring the electrical connections for driving the polymer LEDs. The recitation of 'for transmitting light emanating from the polymer LED display and for reflecting ambient light' has not been given patentable weight because is considered an intended used recitation. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,515,785 to Cobb et al.

Regarding claim 1 Cobb discloses (fig. 5B, column 12 lines 6-9, 37-63) an electronic display device comprising a display 550 including an emissive element 560 with organic light emitting material excited in an addressable matrix forming an image, a light absorbing filter 572 covering the display (tinted layer 572 disposed below the reflective polarizer increases contrast with a high impact on brightness) and a semi-transparent reflective layer 576 covering the filter layer, transmitting light emanating from the emissive display 560. Cobb discloses the claimed invention except display comprising polymer LEDs. It is noted that organic light emitting material can be polymer materials which are well known in the art and hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the emissive display of Cobb to be polymer LED display. The recitation of 'for transmitting light emanating from the polymer LED display and for reflecting ambient light' has not been given patentable weight because is considered an intended used recitation. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987).

Regarding claim 2 Cobb discloses the semi-transparent reflective layer 576 is a reflective polarizer.

Art Unit: 2879

Claims 3, 5- 7 and 11, 12, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,515,785 to Cobb et al. and further in view of USPN 6,388,377 to Kobayashi et al.

Regarding claims 3 and 7 Cobb is silent about an anti-reflection coating on at least one of the polymer LED display, light absorbing filter and semi-transparent reflective layer.

Kobayashi in same filed of endeavor discloses (col. 9 lines 55-60) anti-reflection coating is applied on the surface of the electroluminescent element for reducing reflection of ambient light and improving contrast.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an anti-reflection coating on the organic display device 560 of Cobb as taught by Kobayashi for reducing reflection of ambient light and improving contrast.

Regarding claims 5, 11 Kobayashi discloses (column 1 lines 1-5) this display can be used in an electronic appliance comprising lap top computer, mobile communications.

Regarding claim 6 an electric shaver is a well known small portable electronic appliance with display equivalent to the ones mentioned by Kobayashi and hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the display of Cobb in an electric shaver.

Regarding claims 12, 16 Kobayashi discloses (column 1 lines 1-5) this display can be used in an electronic appliance comprising lap top computer, mobile communications.

Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,515,785 to Cobb et al. and further in view of USPN 6,053,795 to Whitney et al.

Cobb is silent about the reflective layer 576 being a dual brightness enhancement film.

Whitney discloses (column 9 lines 30-45) commercially available reflective polarizers are dual brightness enhancement films, which have high reflectivity for the selected direction over a wide bandwidth.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to select the reflective polarizers of Cobb dual brightness enhancement films as suggested by Whitney which have high reflectivity for the selected direction over a wide bandwidth.

Claims 8 and 10, 13, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,515,785 to Cobb et al., USPN 6,053,795 to Whitney et al. and further in view of USPN 6,388,377 to Kobayashi et al.

Regarding claims 8 and 10 it would have been obvious to select the reflective polarizers of the display having antireflection coating of Cobb and Kobayashi dual

Art Unit: 2879

brightness enhancement films as suggested by Whitney which have high reflectivity for the selected direction over a wide bandwidth.

Regarding claims 13, 17-19 Kobayashi discloses (column 1 lines 1-5) this display can be used in an electronic appliance comprising lap top computer, mobile communications.

Regarding claim 20 an electric shaver is a well known small portable electronic appliance with display equivalent to the ones mentioned by Kobayshi and hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the display of Cobb and Whitney in an electric shaver.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2879

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sikha Roy

Sikha Roy
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2879